

**REMARKS**

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The final Office Action dated December 7, 2005 and the Advisory Action of July 10, 2006 have been received and their contents carefully reviewed. Applicants note that a Notice of Appeal was filed on filed June 6, 2006.

Claims 1-13 are rejected by the Examiner. With this response, claims 1, 8, 10, 11 and 13 have been amended, and claim 7 has been canceled has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-6 and 8-21 remain pending in this application, with claims 14-21 having been withdrawn from consideration. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3-7 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,597,416 to Momose et al. (hereinafter "Momose"); claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Momose in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,336,535 to Fukuchi et al. (hereinafter "Fukuchi"); claims 8-9 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Momose and U.S. Patent No. 5,9084,294 to Bogomolny (hereinafter "Bogomolny"); claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Momose in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,388,729 to Ahn et al. (hereinafter "Ahn"); and claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Momose and U.S. Patent No. 5,670,994 to Kawaguchi et al. (hereinafter "Kawaguchi").

The rejection to claims 1, 3-7 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Momose is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3-7 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Momose. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 1 and request reconsideration. Independent claim 1 is allowable in that it recites "a support main," and "a fixing device for inserting a digitizer, wherein the fixing device has a floor part and a covering part, wherein the floor part adheres to a rear surface of the support main, and wherein the digitizer is inserted between the floor part and the covering part." Nothing in Momose teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, and its dependent claims 3-6 and 10, are allowable over Momose.

The rejection to claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Momose in view of Fukuchi is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 2, which depends from independent claim 1, is allowable in that Fukuchi fails to cure the deficiency of Momose to teach or suggest the feature of claim 1 discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 2, as it depends from claim 1, is allowable over any combination of Momose and Fukuchi.

The rejection to claims 8–9 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Momose and Bogomolny is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claims 8–9 and 12, which depend from independent claim 1, are allowable in that Bogomolny fails to cure the deficiency of Momose to teach or suggest the feature of claim 1 discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 8–9 and 12, as they depend from claim 1, are allowable over any combination of Momose and Bogomolny.

The rejection to claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Momose in view of Ahn is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 11, which depends from claim 1, is allowable in that Ahn fails to cure the deficiency of Momose to teach or suggest the feature of claim 1 discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 11, as it depends from claim 1, is allowable over any combination of Momose and Ahn.

The rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Momose and Kawaguchi is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 13, which depends from independent claim 1, is allowable because Kawaguchi fails to cure the deficiency of Momose to teach or suggest the feature of claim 1 discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 13, as it depends from claim 1, is allowable over any combination of Momose and Kawaguchi.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps

necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. *A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.*

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 2, 2006

By

  
Valerie P. Hayes

Registration No. 53,005  
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500  
Attorneys for Applicant